PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

KUSANO, YUKIHIRO, et al.

Docket No: Q65935

Appln. No.: 09/960,345

Group Art Unit: 1771

Confirmation No.: 4619

Examiner: Norca Liz Torres Velazquez

Filed: September 24, 2001

For: RUBBER-BASED COMPOSITE MATERIAL AND RUBBER ARTICLE USING THE SAME

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.132

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

I, Masato Yoshikawa, hereby declare and state as follows:

I am the same declarant who performed the experimentation described in the Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 dated June 21, 2005, and filed on June 29, 2005. My personal history remains as stated in my prior Declaration.

This Supplemental Declaration is the same as the prior Declaration, except that it specifics that the driver's feeling and the evaluation was classified in comparison to the control in term of values 0; +2; +4 and +8 and that the total points are expressed in indexes based on the control of 100.

EXPERIMENT

A non-woven fabric was treated with a conventional dip treatment. A radial tire was prepared in the same manner as described in the examples in the specification of the present application except for using the above-treated non-woven fabric. The obtained tire is designated as Comparative Example I.

Comparative Example I was evaluated in terms of driving stability and practical durability in the same manner as described in the examples in the specification of the present application. In addition, Comparative Example I and the tires described in the examples (Examples and Comparative Examples) of the specification of the present application were evaluated in terms of the following vibration-riding comfort test:

(Vibration-riding comfort)

The same car as in the driving test was partially driven at a speed of 40-80 km/hr on a good road, a joint road and a bad road. The vibration-riding comfort was evaluated based on the driver's feeling. The evaluation was classified in comparison to the control as follows:

0: It is equivalent to the control

+2: It is possibly slightly better than the control

+4: It is slightly better than the control

+8: It is better than the control

The total points are expressed in indexes based on the control of 100.

The results together with those contained in Table 2 at page 13 of the specification of the present application are summarized in the following Tables:

		Conventional example	Comparative example	Comparative example I
Results	Driving stability	100	110	113
	Vibration riding comfort	100	138	119
	Practical durability	100	174	183

		Example 1	Example 2	Example 3	Example 4	Example 5	Example 6
Results	Driving stability	118	119	115	113	116	117
	Vibration riding comfort	135	137	132	133	131	129
	Practical durability	180	193	191	182	190	189

As shown in the above Tables, Comparative Example I provided driving stability of 113, vibration riding of 119 and practical durability of 183. In contrast, Examples 1-6 provided driving stability of 113 to 119, vibration riding of 129-137 and practical durability of 180-193. It is clear that the present invention is superior to Comparative Example I at least in terms of vibration riding comfort.

I conclude that the present invention provides unexpected superior results by applying a non-woven fabric coated with a metallic compound reactable with sulfur by a PVD or CVD method compared to a tire using a conventionally dip-treated non-woven fabric.

I declare further that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these

statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Date: July 13, 2006

Masato Yoshikawa
Masato Yoshikawa